



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/695,972 | 10/29/2003 | Michal Jacovi | IL920030021US1 | 7990 |

7590 11/24/2009
Stephen C. Kaufman
IBM Corporation
Intellectual Property Law Dept.
P.O. Box 218
Yorktown Heights, NY 10598

| |
|----------|
| EXAMINER |
|----------|

YAARY, MICHAEL D

| | |
|----------|--------------|
| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|

2193

| | |
|-----------|---------------|
| MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
|-----------|---------------|

11/24/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| | | | |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. 10/695,972 | Applicant(s) JACOVI ET AL. | |
| | Examiner MICHAEL YAARY | Art Unit 2193 | |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 July 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 15-25 and 37 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 15-25 and 37 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 15-25 and 37 are pending in the application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 15 and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rickards, III et al (hereafter Rickards) in view of Frid-Nielsen (US Pat. 5,740,444).

Frid-Nielsen was cited in the previous office action dated 05/12/2009.

4. **As to claims 15 and 37**, Rickards discloses a method comprising:

Enabling peer support for a user, wherein said peer support is available from a universe of users with a commonality of interest with said user; and enabling said user to communicate with at least one of said users (Column 7, lines 11-24; column 16, lines 22-55; and figure 7 disclose a work project loaded for a user (peer-to-peer) and displaying the corresponding discussion or allowing the capability for a discussion.).

Art Unit: 2193

5. Rickards does not explicitly disclose the enabling is from within an integrated development environment (IDE), and wherein said commonality of interest is determined by at least one context of work within said IDE.

However, Frid-Nielson discloses the enabling is from within an integrated development environment (IDE), and wherein said commonality of interest is determined by at least one context of work within said IDE (Abstract; column 3, lines 28-40; and column 7, line 52-column 10 disclose an object-oriented development environment; more specifically an integrated development environment with interface accepting user instructions in a development system. Thus, when combined with the teachings of Rickards, the combination would allow for a collaborative integrated development environment.).

6. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Rickards by implementing a user accessible integrated development environment, as taught by Frid-Nielson, for the benefit of allowing access to components located remotely from directly within an IDE. Furthermore, the combination would allow for comprehensive software development for a plurality of programmers. Motivation to combine can be found in that the IDE, as taught by Frid-Nielson, would allow provide a developer with the ability to easily manage complex data structures (Frid-Nielson, column 3, lines 19-25).

Art Unit: 2193

7. Claims 16-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rickards and Frid-Nielson as applied to claim 15 above, and further in view of Fitzpatrick et al. (hereafter Fitzpatrick)(US Pat. 7,039,677).

Fitzpatrick was cited in the previous office action dated 05/12/2009.

8. **As to claim 16**, the combination of Rickards and Frid-Nielson do not disclose accessing peer support comprises displaying at least one list of existing topics of discussion and providing said user with a selector to select one of said topics.

However, Fitzpatrick discloses accessing peer support comprises displaying at least one list of existing topics of discussion and providing said user with a selector to select one of said topics (column 3, lines 24-31).

9. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Rickards and Frid-Nielson, by displaying topics of discussion, as taught by Fitzpatrick, for the benefit of expanding the collaborative capabilities in an integrated development environment.

10. **As to claim 17**, the combination of Rickards, Frid-Nielson, and Fitzpatrick disclose wherein said providing also comprises opening a window for said user to participate in selected discussion (Fitzpatrick, column 2, lines 59-62).

Art Unit: 2193

11. **As to claim 18**, the combination of Rickards, Frid-Nielson, and Fitzpatrick disclose wherein said opening comprises retrieving said selected topic from a collaborative development server (Rickards, server of fig. 22)).

12. **As to claims 19 and 22**, the combination of Rickards, Frid-Nielson, and Fitzpatrick disclose said accessing peer support comprises determining a context of work for a user of said peer support (Fitzpatrick, column 3, lines 37-40).

13. **As to claims 20 and 23**, the combination of Rickards, Frid-Nielson, and Fitzpatrick disclose selecting from said existing topics those related to said context of work (Fitzpatrick, column 3, lines 24-31 and 37-40).

14. **As to claim 21**, the combination of Rickards, Frid-Nielson, and Fitzpatrick disclose accessing peer support comprises providing a user with means to ask questions of peers (Rickards, discussion/chat of figure 7).

15. **As to claim 24**, the claim is rejected for similar reasons using the same rationale as claims 15 and 16 above.

16. **As to claim 25**, the combination of Rickards, Frid-Nielson, and Fitzpatrick disclose said work is defined by at least one of the following: the current file, the current

Art Unit: 2193

class, the current object, the current project, and the current function (Frid-Nielson, abstract).

Response to Arguments

17. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 15-25 and 37 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Proposed Examiner's Amendment

18. Provided below is a proposal for an amendment to independent claims 15, 24, and 37 that is believed to place application in condition for allowance:

A method comprising:

accessing peer support resources, wherein said peer support resources are available from a universe of users with a commonality of interest with said user, external to an integrated development environment (IDE) from within said IDE upon instructions from a user of said IDE;

determining, using a context fetcher, a context in which a current programmer is operating, wherein the context is determined by one or more of the following: the groups to which a programmer has registered with and currently operating under, the

Art Unit: 2193

code the programmer is currently working on, or the review of the windows and menu of the IDE that the programmer may be currently working in; and

enabling said user to communicate with said resources using a discussion builder which groups users together based on the context information from the context fetcher,

wherein when the programmer changes the code they are working on or the groups they are part of, the discussion builder dynamically sends a different set of discussions associated with the new code or group to be displayed.

24) A method comprising:

determining, using a context fetcher, a context in which a current programmer is operating, wherein the context is determined by one or more of the following: the groups to which a programmer has registered with and currently operating under, the code the programmer is currently working on, or the review of the windows and menu of the IDE that the programmer may be currently working in;

forwarding the context information to a discussion builder;

displaying current topics of discussions, using a discussion builder, based on work being performed in an integrated development environment, wherein when the programmer changes the code they are working on or the groups they are part of, the discussion builder dynamically sends a different topics of discussions associated with the new code or group to be displayed; and

Art Unit: 2193

enabling a user to select one of said topics.

37) A method comprising:

enabling peer support for a user from within an integrated development environment (IDE), wherein said peer support is available from a universe of users with a commonality of interest with said user, wherein said commonality of interest is determined by at least one context of work within said IDE, wherein enabling peer support comprises perform the steps of:

determining, using a context fetcher, a context in which a user is operating under, wherein the context is determined by one or more of the following: the groups to which a user has registered with and currently operating under, the code the user is currently working on, or the review of the windows and menu of the IDE that the user may be currently working in; and

enabling said user to communicate with at least one of said other users using a discussion builder which groups users together based on the context information from the context fetcher, wherein when the user changes the code they are working on or the groups they are part of, the discussion builder dynamically sends a different set of discussions associated with the new code or group to be displayed.

Conclusion

Art Unit: 2193

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MICHAEL YAARY whose telephone number is (571)270-1249. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 9 a.m.-5:30 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lewis Bullock can be reached on 571-272-3759. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/M. Y./
Examiner, Art Unit 2193

/Lewis A. Bullock, Jr./
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2193